



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE HISTORICAL INFINITIVE

II. ITS LITERARY ELABORATION

By J. J. SCHLICHER

The present paper will treat of the historical infinitive in Sallust, the *Bellum Africanum*, Horace, Virgil, Livy, and Tacitus. Its title is not quite accurate. As we saw in an earlier connection,¹ the manipulation of the construction and its extension into new fields had already begun to appear in the later authors of the Ciceronian period, and there are manifestations of independence in its use even after Tacitus. Moreover, of the authors mentioned above, Horace, in his use of the construction, belongs strictly to the preceding period, and he does not show the distinctive developments common to his contemporaries. But a certain overlapping is unavoidable, and some division of the subject is imposed by the necessary limits of an article. A third paper will deal with the period of the decline.

SALLUST

Sallust has the distinction of using the historical infinitive much more frequently than any other author. He also uses long series more frequently. Very long series, of more than four infinitives, are elsewhere quite exceptional. Only Livy and Tacitus use them to some extent, especially in the earlier part of their work, Livy having 18 with a total of 114 infinitives, and Tacitus 17 with a total of 106. Sallust alone has 31 in his two short works, about one-fourth of all the passages containing the construction, with a total of 213 infinitives.

To be sure, neither the frequency of its use, nor the length of the series, though striking, in itself proves a new treatment of the construction. And yet both are intimately connected with it. The extensive employment of a construction which in its native state is only moderately common, almost necessarily involves its spread into fields where it had not been used before. That this was actually the case in Sallust is shown, first of all, by the use of a very large number

¹ Cf. p. 280.

of verbs and expressions of action which would not have been employed in the early period, or at least but very sparingly and in special cases, since they distinctly imply deliberate purpose and preparation rather than impulse or emotion. A small part of Sallust—about one-fourth of the passages in the *Jugurthine War*—furnishes the following:

cuncta parare, scrutari loca abdita, hostibus terrorem augere, dolis temptare, ad virtutem arrigere, vendere, sedare motus, animos mollire, trahere omnia, polliceri deditioem, metum simulare, consulem ludificare, vineas agere, aggerem iacere, missitare legatos, exercitum ductare, centuriones corrumpere, supplementum scribere, auxilia accersere.

The great majority of these are nothing more than the various operations incident to warfare. Evidently, to Sallust, the distinct presence of an element of calculation and deliberation, of control of his actions by the actor is no longer a bar to the use of the historical infinitive.

The environment, furthermore, in which we find the infinitives has become in part a very different one. The expressions in which they occur are no longer so abrupt and brief as was the rule in the early period. They are often carefully introduced by words and phrases showing their relation to what has gone before, as in any other form of statement. *Nam, sed, igitur, eo modo, contra ea, ita, tamen, deinde, itaque, tantum modo, interim, ad hoc, ex eo tempore, praeterea, neque idcirco minus, simul, per idem tempus, denique*, and the like are quite common. They are far more numerous in Sallust than the purely intensifying modifiers of the early period. This indicates that the actions expressed by the infinitives are no longer represented as breaking in suddenly and swaying the situation for the time being, as they used to do, but that they have their work in the narrative carefully assigned to them in subordination to the whole. The manipulation of the matter by the writer is thus distinctly apparent.

This is true also of another device of which Sallust is quite fond, the formation of series in which the infinitive is used in co-ordination with indicatives. This sort of combination has been extensively commented upon as having some possible bearing upon the force of

the historical infinitive. Its cultivation from this time on,¹ in Livy, Tacitus, and the epic poets, seems to be due largely to Sallust's example, and its use by him is perhaps best attributed to the "inconcinnity" which he favored, and which is itself a striving for effect, resulting of course in a purely artificial and premeditated form of expression. The colors are laid on with foresight and calculation, the infinitive being placed where it will produce the desired effect in its relation to the rest of the passage.

Another evidence of Sallust's analysis and manipulation of the construction is his very frequent use of such distinguishing and coordinating words as: *pars—pars, partim—partim, modo—modo, alii—alii*, etc., to set off the various infinitives against each other. A group of acts by different persons, related in some way, but often contrasted among themselves, are thus bound together into a single whole. This is a decided departure from the early practice, when the various elements of a series were regularly presented as so many closely related acts of the same individual or individuals, prompted by the same emotion or impulse. In fact, as we saw,² it was thus that the series probably originated. In Sallust these various actions are parts of a whole, to be sure, but the unifying bond is not in the action or in the actor so much as in the author's mind; e.g.: "*Arma capere alii, alii se abdere, pars territoria confirmare, trepidare omnibus locis*" (*Jug.* 38. 5). "*Optimus quisque cadere aut sauciari, ceteris metus augeri. at Marius . . . anxius trahere cum animo suo omitteretne inceptum*" (*Jug.* 93. 1). Passages like this occur very rarely in the early period, as in Cic. *Ver.* 4. 149: "*Primum senatores clamare sibi eripi ius . . . ; populus senatum laudare, gratias agere; cives Romani a me nusquam discedere.*" But they lack the distinguishing words which are the earmarks of Sallust's usage. This fact and their rareness show that they are not devised, as Sallust's were, for effect.

The older historical infinitive, as we saw,³ is rather strictly limited as to the subordinate clauses which accompany it. It is only

¹ In Sallust the imperfect is rather more frequently used in this way than either the present or the perfect, but less frequently than these two combined. In Livy the perfect predominates. In Tacitus, on the other hand, the imperfect is used far more frequently than the other tenses.

² Cf. pp. 288 ff.

³ P. 281.

in Caesar and Varro that we find this list beginning to increase. Sallust extends it still farther, and uses subordinate clauses more freely, so that in his works the historical infinitive appears to have all the freedom in this respect which other forms of statement have.

Sallust is the first one, so far as our knowledge goes, who uses the historical infinitive itself in subordinate clauses. This is entirely in line with his general practice. For a subordinate clause is itself more especially the product of thinking. And a historical infinitive in a subordinate clause means that what was once a spontaneous form of expression is now employed in surroundings which are the result of analysis and deliberation rather than impulse. In other words, its presence in a subordinate clause is unnatural, and it must be said that Sallust did not carry this practice very far. For in spite of his freedom in the use of the construction, he had a true feeling for its possible functions and its limitations, and he did in fact confine it to loosely attached clauses, such as the continuing relative (*Jug.* 59. 3; 70. 5) and *cum inversum* (*Jug.* 98. 2).

The same restraint combined with freedom we find also in his use of *esse* and the passive voice. Out of the 16 passives which he uses, 15 are found in the course of series which are begun by active forms, the remaining one being used alone, and impersonally (*agitari*, *Jug.* 30. 1). Out of 19 uses of *esse* and its compounds, 15 are found in the course of the series, only one at the beginning of a series (*Cat.* 20. 7), and three stand alone (*Jug.* 73. 4; 95. 3; *Cat.* 25. 5). The same is true also of other verbs of static or receptive force. Out of 38 uses of *habere*, *pati*, *credere*, *cedere*, *loqui*, *sinere*, *requiescere*, *opperiri*, *dormire*, *morari*, *meminisse*, *cognoscere*, *cadere*, 36 are found in the course of a series, and only two at the beginning (*pati*, *Cat.* 13. 3; *credere*, *Jug.* 72. 2). It will, of course, readily be granted that it is easier to continue a series already begun, than to begin one, with an unusual word. For the initial word of a series will inevitably exercise a sort of leveling effect on the rest, very much like that of the subjunctive mood in so-called cases of attraction.

Sallust supports his infinitives splendidly and never compels them to do service in commonplace situations. When the time to strike comes, however, he leads forth all his reserves like a general on the battlefield. No doubt the great length of his series is for the most

part due to a feeling that it was good strategy to back up his sweeping squadrons by others and still others, in order to drive the attack home. It is thus in large part that he produces the impression of vigor and rapidity for which his style is noted. The description in *Jug.* 51. 1 may serve as an illustration: "Ceterum facies totius negoti varia, incerta, foeda atque miserabilis: dispersi a suis pars cedere alii insequi, neque signa neque ordines observare, ubi quemque periculum ceperat, ibi resistere ac propulsare: arma, tela, equi, viri, hostes atque cives permixti, nihil consilio neque imperio agi, fors omnia regere."

A second kind of support, less spectacular but equally effective, is the introduction of the infinitives by some word or expression which will give them the proper emotional coloring. An example or two will illustrate: "*Cupidine caecus* ob thesauros oppidi potiundi, vineas agere, aggerem iacere aliaque, quae incepto usui forent, properare" (*Jug.* 37. 4). "Quod postquam auditum est, tum vero *ingens metus* *nostros invadit*: credere se proditos . . . et insidiis circumventos" (*Jug.* 106. 6). Such expressions are quite frequent, and they often serve, as in these examples, to give standing to a set of verbs which would, under ordinary circumstances, be out of place as historical infinitives. We shall have more to say about this particular form of the construction when we reach Tacitus.

The general conclusion we come to regarding Sallust's use of the historical infinitive is that, while he extended it into fields which it had not previously occupied, and although he employed it largely for effect, as a literary device, he did so with due regard to its original force and its possibilities, and preserved well its character as a construction for expressing direct and strenuous action.

THE BELLUM AFRICANUM

In the hands of a meaner writer than Sallust, such abundant use of a striking and peculiar form of expression might easily fall flat, and result in quite the opposite of what Sallust uniformly accomplished by it. That this is no mere theory is shown by Sallust's contemporary, the writer of the *Bellum Africanum*.

The author of this book, apparently a subordinate in the army during the campaign he describes, was possessed of but slight

literary skill. There is scarcely anything to relieve the dead level of his narrative, and this general quality appears in his use of the historical infinitive also. Whereas in Sallust the construction could be made to portray the rush and vigor of a battle or a campaign, in the *Bellum Africanum* it stands as a rule simply for action undertaken, generally with very little indication of its character, except that regard is had to its mere performance rather than the achievement of its end; e.g.: "Interim Caesar a mari non digredi neque mediterranea petere propter navium errorem, equitatumque in navibus omnem continere, ut arbitror, ne agri vastarentur" (*Bel. Afr.* vii. 4).

Of the seventy-odd cases of *interim* which are said to be found in the book, and which constitute perhaps the most striking evidence of the writer's poverty of expression, a surprisingly large number—eleven in all—fall to the 25 sentences containing historical infinitives. This in itself in a way indicates the extent to which he failed to appreciate the real force of the construction. For *interim* merely sets another occurrence by the side of the one just reported, and in no wise represents it as particularly important or conspicuous. It usually introduces a change of actors—for example, in ten of the eleven cases mentioned above—and allows no chance for an accumulation of momentum, no preparation for the explosive act which is the real province of the historical infinitive.¹

In the choice of verbs also the writer of the *Bellum Africanum* shows but little insight into the force of the construction. It is only occasionally that we meet any of the old favorites, like *instare*, *adhortari*, *obsecrare*, or combinations like *mirari at requirere*. The great bulk of the verbs appear to be employed without much discrimination—*continere*, *adaugeri*, *convenire*, *polliceri*, *digredi*, *antecedere*, *versari*, *munire*, *vallum ducere*, *officinas instruere*, *vagari*, *in statione habere*, *se recipere*, *munitiones facere*, *prodire*, *pervenire*, *occupati esse*, *praecipere*, *cingere copias*. Unlike Sallust, the writer of the *Bellum Africanum* does scarcely anything to support these verbs and furnish them with an emotional setting.

¹ Sallust has *interim* or *interea* with infinitives about a dozen times, but the infinitives are nearly always carefully prepared for, especially in the *Jugurtha*, either by intervening words or phrases, or by coming after other historical infinitives in the preceding sentence. Livy uses infinitives in this way very rarely, as does Tacitus, until we reach the *Annals*, where they are slightly more frequent (about seven cases).

In some respects, it is true, he shows moderation compared with Sallust. While the single infinitive occurs only five times, the series are short as a rule, only one having more than four infinitives (chap. xx). The construction is not used in subordinate clauses, and the sentences are on the whole simpler than Sallust's.

HORACE

Horace's use of the historical infinitive is characterized by self-restraint, and belongs in its whole manner to the older period. He has it in twelve passages, of which nine are in the *Satires*, one in the *Epodes*, and two in the *Epistles*. In eight of these passages single infinitives are used, only one passage having as many as three. The various emotions, fright, surprise, shame, and distress or confusion, account for most of them. A few passages will illustrate his manner: *Sat.* i. 8. 47: "at illae currere in urbem" (fright). *Sat.* i. 9. 8-10: "misere discedere quaerens | Ire modo ocuis, interdum consistere, in aurem | Dicere nescio quid puero" (distress). *Epist.* i. 7. 61-62: "non sane credere Mena, | Mirari secum tacitus" (surprise). *Epist.* i. 7. 66-67: "Ille Philippo | Excusare laborem et mercennaria vincla" (confusion). *Sat.* i. 5. 30-31: "Hic oculis ego nigra meis collyria lippis | Illinere" (impatience due to discomfort).

VIRGIL

Virgil deserves special mention, if only for the reason that it was his employment of the historical infinitive in the *Aeneid* which in all probability assured its use in epic poetry from that time on. He has the construction in 32 passages, of which two are in the *Georgics*, the rest in the *Aeneid*. Only eight of these have single infinitives, which ranges him along with Sallust and Tacitus rather than with Cicero and Horace. More probably this small proportion of single infinitives in Virgil is due to the weight and dignity which the greater fulness of the series carries with it, and thus fits it especially for the epic.

His use of the construction is conspicuous for the large proportion of passives (10 in the 32 passages). This follows naturally from the frequency with which he uses the infinitives to express the awe or helplessness of human beings in the presence of what occurs to control their destiny.¹ Natural phenomena (*Aen.* iii. 141; vi. 557; vii.

¹ Cf. Group VI, p. 291.

15-18; viii. 15-16, 90) and the relentless operation of fate (*Georg.* i. 199-200; *Aen.* ii. 132, 169; iv. 421-22) both play an important part.

A certain proportion of rather unusual and picturesque words occur, as we expect in poetry, but otherwise there is little that is out of the ordinary. Virgil is in this respect much closer to the early norm than Sallust or Livy, though not so close as Horace. The archaic character of his usage is especially evident in the frequent addition of intensifying words (*semper*, *retro* [*referri*], *vero*, *una*, *omnes*, *nihil*, *ingenti* [*trepidare metu*], *totum*, *omne*, *solam*). Especially noteworthy are the intensifying expressions which are at the same time rich in descriptive value, such as *saeva sonare verbera* (*Aen.* vi. 557), *steriles exurere agros* (iii. 141), *arcanos credere sensus* (iv. 422), *duris detrudere contis* (ix. 510), *vario misceri motu* (xii. 217).¹ Supporting adjectives and participles, as in Sallust, are also found, especially those expressing fear (*pavidi*, *trepidi*, *turbati*). Another probable evidence of Sallustian influence is the use of *pars*—*pars* (*Aen.* i. 423-25; vi. 491-92; xi. 883).

LIVY

Livy's use of the historical infinitive is less individual and more composite than that of any other writer up to his time. A large proportion of his cases are normal specimens of the simple type (*hortari*, *trepidare*, *postulare*, *negare*, *rogare*, *petere*, *intueri mirabundi*, *cura agitare*, *monere*, *orare*, *fremere*, *ruere*, *manare gaudio lacrimae*, *conclamare omnes*, *admirari*, *circuire solliciti*, *instare*, *currere ad sua tutanda*, *resistere*, etc.). He shows the influence of Cicero, especially in the earlier books, by the use of the abrupt type,² in which the infinitive begins the sentence (e.g.: i. 17, 46; ii. 24, 27, 50, 58; iii. 16, 35, 37, 38; iv. 37, 44, etc.). Another peculiarity, probably due to Cicero, or at least to rhetoric, is the repetition of the same infinitive in successive clauses (e.g.: *dirimere*, i. 13; *timere*, ii. 32; *nolle*, ii. 45; *instare*, iii. 19; *odisse*, iii. 37, etc.).

Livy has in common with Sallust the use of co-ordinating and responsive words like *pars*—*pars*, *alii*—*alii*, *nunc*—*nunc*, and he also has the series composed of mixed infinitives and indicatives. Both of these occur rather less frequently than in Sallust.³ They

¹ These were especially cultivated by Virgil's imitators in the first century A.D.

² Cf. p. 286.

³ Cf. p. 376 and n. 1.

alone would show that Livy's use of the historical infinitive is not a simple one.

In the use of subordinate clauses depending on the infinitive clause, the advance made by Sallust is maintained. In the kinds of subordinate clauses used, however, Livy differs from him, and shows more affinity with the earlier usage. In Sallust the commonest variety of subordinate clause is the relative. In Livy, as in Cicero, it is the various forms of *oratio obliqua*, especially the accusative and infinitive. But in the complexity and extent of his subordinate clauses Livy goes far beyond any other writer. A large number of these clauses, particularly the various forms of indirect discourse, are in turn modified by other clauses subordinate to them; or additional clauses of the same or related types, and co-ordinate with them, are added, so that the whole expression depending on the infinitive often becomes very long and elaborate; e.g.: "Ad ea consul, moveri quidem se vel periculo eorum vel metu, dicere; sed sibi nequaquam tantum copiarum esse ut, cum magna vis hostium haud procul absit, et, quam mox signis collatis dimicandum sit, in dies expectet, dividendo exercitum minuere tuto vires possit" (xxxiv. 11. 3 ff.).

This form of the construction is especially common in the later books. For other examples cf. ii. 55. 2; iii. 12. 6; iii. 17. 10; iii. 23. 7; iv. 25. 10; v. 29. 8; xxxi. 25. 9; xxxi. 35. 3; xxxii. 36. 6; xxxiv. 11. 4; 58. 4; 61. 6; xxxv. 12. 7; 45. 5; 46. 5; 49. 1; xxxvii. 10. 9; xxxviii. 8. 6, etc.

What we have said in a previous connection¹ about subordinate clauses applies with double force to such expressions as these. They are, first of all, the result of extensive and detailed thinking, which is altogether inconsistent with that impulsiveness which was the original mark of the historical infinitive. Their great elaboration suggests a degree of leisureliness and self-direction which is incompatible either with the commission or the sympathetic reproduction in speech of an impulsive act. Even if we wish to assume that the infinitive itself in such a case still carries with it its original force, the necessary shifting of the attention to the numerous details of the expression which follow will cause both the reader or hearer and the

¹ Cf. p. 377.

speaker himself to lose sight of the nature of the act in the main clause as previously expressed by the infinitive.

Together with this practice goes a strong tendency to use single infinitives, which increases greatly in the later books. And if, in addition, as is actually the case, a large proportion of the verbs thus used in the infinitive are verbs which do not in themselves suggest impulsive or emotional action, like *dicere* and *credere*, then it is clear that we have reached a point where the historical infinitive has definitely lost touch with its older use. Except for the fact that he was keeping up a tradition and for the most part was using the verbs that had been used in the construction by Cicero and others, Livy's historical infinitives in the later books are very often not distinguishable in meaning from indicatives.¹

TABLE I

	Number of infinitives in series									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Books 1-10	91	46	26	10	3	4	5			
Books 21-30	51	22	12	3	2			1		1
Books 31-40	52	21	7	2						
Books 1- 5	65	32	14	7	3	3	5			
Books 41-45	17	6	3		1		1			

It has been observed that there is a very distinct development in Livy's style between the first books and those of the third and following decades.² There is a corresponding change also in his use of the historical infinitive. It is evident, first of all, in the diminished frequency of the construction. The first decade has 185 passages, the third has 92, the fourth has 82. The contrast is still more striking if we compare the first five books, which have 129 passages, with the last five, which have only 28 (see Table I). The change in the length of the series also is quite marked. Not only do the series

¹ Cicero's use of verbs of saying in the historical infinitive is very different. They regularly express strong assertion or opposition, and their impulsive character is indicated by such accompanying words as *statim*, *omnes*, *vero*, *contra*, and by the use of such verbs as *clamare*, *affirmare*, *instare*, and *negare*; cf. p. 286.

² Cf., for example, Stacey, "D. Entwicklung d. livianischen Styls," *Archiv f. lat. Lex.*, X, 17-82.

of three or more infinitives become less numerous as the work proceeds, but the single infinitives become relatively more numerous.

The author further becomes more conservative, as he proceeds, also in the number and variety of verbs which he uses. This tendency is in two directions. In the first place, many picturesque and figurative expressions which are often substitutes merely for the old types are dropped,¹ and the choice more strictly confined to the well-worn common words enumerated above. On the other hand there is a hardening of certain individual peculiarities of the author also into narrower lines. This is especially noticeable in certain verbs of static force, like *dicere* and *credere*, which come to be used singly to a very large extent in the later books. In the first decade these are used singly 8 times, in series 14 times, in the rest of the books they are used singly 26 times, in series only 9 times.

Not only does this indicate, as we saw, a drifting away from earlier usage, but it suggests also a loss of interest in the construction. In the earlier books it is repeatedly used with all its old-time spirit, as, for example, during the description of the plebeian troubles (ii. 23-28) or of the incidents of the decemvirate (iii. 36 and 37). Livy makes an honest effort to adapt the construction to his own broad and exuberant style, chiefly by the variation and elaboration of the old simple and direct expressions. In doing so, to be sure, he sometimes dilutes the construction unduly by modifying words and phrases, or changes its aspect by introducing static verbs, or verbs involving calculation or deliberation; e.g.: "*Nec iam publicis magis consiliis Servius quam privatis munire opes*" (i. 42. 1). "*Nec patres satis moderate ferre laetitiam*" (ii. 54. 10).

In the earlier books he takes some pains to support unusual words by preparatory expressions similar to those used so much by Sallust; e.g.: "*Hinc robore corporibus animisque sumpto iam non feras tantum subsistere, sed in latrones praeda onustos impetus facere, pastoribusque rapta dividere*" (i. 4. 9). But as time goes on this becomes rarer, as also does the use of the supporting series,²

¹ In the earlier books: "*Versare in omnes partes muliebrem animum, in ingenti gloria esse, pudor pectora versare, externa et domestica odia certare in animis, personare fabulam, agitare suo veneno, sermones tempori aptos serere, se plebi venditare, urgere scutis, micare gladiis, manare gaudio lacrimae, lux adpropinquans exanimare, ruina acies in praeceps deferri.*"

² Cf. pp. 377 ff.

and in the later books the construction has become rather infrequent and stereotyped, and commonplace in its effect.

A final proof that Livy did not, at bottom, have a true feeling for the genuine force of the construction is furnished by the way in which he used words like *esse*, and the passive voice. These, it will be recalled, had not been used in the earlier period, except in a very few special cases.¹ Sallust used them more extensively, but in a way which shows that he did not consider them to have good standing as historical infinitives. For in him they are almost invariably found in the course of a series which is introduced by words of dynamic force. Livy used them with very little regard to their position, that is, without making much distinction between them and

TABLE II

	Sallust	Livy
<i>Passives</i> (including <i>feri</i>):		
Single infinitives.....	1	12
Beginning the series.....	0	7
In the course of the series . . .	15	19
<i>Esse</i> and its compounds:		
Single infinitives.....	3	13
Beginning the series.....	1	5
In the course of the series . . .	15	18

other words. The difference between the two authors is seen from the figures given in Table II. It should be stated that in this matter Livy shows a slight tendency toward conservatism in his later books, infinitives of this sort at the beginning of the series being relatively somewhat less numerous and those in the course of the series relatively more numerous than in the first decade.

In summing up Livy's case, we may say that he gives the impression of one employing a construction which was not native to him. His usage from the start is composite, showing distinct imitation of both Cicero and Sallust in important particulars. There is considerable wavering in his method, as is shown by the changes which his use of the construction undergoes in the course of his work. He has none too firm a grasp of the fundamental force of the construction, as is evident from the way in which he handles *esse* and the passive

¹ Cf. pp. 287 ff.

voice. It is evident also from his large use of static verbs, and especially from the nature of certain forms of expression which he developed and used a great deal, for example, the single infinitives *dicere* and *credere* followed by long and elaborate passages of indirect discourse. That is to say, the types of the historical infinitive which are most distinctively his own are static and analytic in their character, and have little affinity with the original dynamic and impulsive force of the construction.

TACITUS

In his earliest use of the historical infinitive Tacitus appears as a pupil of Sallust. The series are unusually long, six of the twelve passages in the *Agricola* having four or more infinitives each. Five of them, furthermore, show more or less extensive internal similarity to passages with the historical infinitive in the *Jugurthine War*.

The characterization of *Agricola* (chap. 5) is modeled on that of *Jugurtha*:

Agr. 5: Neque segniter ad voluptates et commeatus titulum tribunatus et inscitiam rettulit; sed noscere provinciam, nosci exercitui, discere a peritis, sequi optimos, nihil adpetere in iactationem, nihil ob formidinem recusare simulque et anxius et intentus agere.

Jug. 6. 1: Non se luxui neque inertiae corrumpendum dedit, sed, uti mos gentis illius est, equitare, iaculati, cursu cum aequalibus certare, et cum omnis gloria anteiret, omnibus tamen carus esse; ad hoc pleraque tempora in venando agere, leonem atque alias feras primus aut in primis ferire, plurimum facere, minimum ipse de se loqui.

The last words of this passage are an echo also of *Jug.* 23. 1, which ends similarly—"prorsus intentus cuncta parare."

Agricola 37. ll. 9 ff. is in structure and effect, and even in the individual words, very like *Jug.* 101. 11.

Agr. 37: Tum vero patentibus locis grande et atrox spectaculum: sequi, vulnerare, capere atque eosdem, oblati aliis trucidare, iam hostium, prout cuique ingenium erat, catervae armatorum paucioribus terga praestare, quidam inermes ultro ruere ac se morti offerre.

Jug. 101. 11: Tum spectaculum horribile in campis patentibus: sequi, fugere, occidi, rapi; equi, viri afflicti, ac multi vulneribus acceptis neque fugere posse neque quietem pati, niti modo ac statim concidere; postremo omnia, qua visus erat, constrata telis, armis, cadaveribus, et inter ea humus infectus sanguine.

Less extensive imitations are found in three other passages:

Agr. 38. l. 4: Eligere latebras et statim relinquere.

Agr. 27. l. 8: At Britanni. . . . nihil ex adrogantia remittere.

Agr. 20. l. 6: Nihil interim apud hostis quietum pati.

Jug. 101. 11: Niti modo ac statim concidere.

Jug. 98. 2: Barbari nihil remittere.

Jug. 88. 2: Nihil apud se remissum neque apud illos tutum pati.

Jug. 66. 1: Prorsus nihil intactum neque quietum pati.

In the *Histories* and *Annals* the strong individuality of Tacitus asserts itself, and his use of the historical infinitive, like his use of the language as a whole, gradually becomes a thing peculiarly his own. This appears first of all in the length of the series. While one-third of the passages in Sallust and one-half in the *Agricola* had four or more infinitives each, less than 18 per cent have this length in the *Histories*, and somewhat over 9 per cent only in the *Annals*.

TABLE III

	<i>Histories</i>	<i>An.</i> i-vi	<i>An.</i> xi-xvi
Single infinitives	5	4	3
Beginning the series	1	7	9
In the body of the series	11	9	4

That his style was changing to the very end is still further seen in the use which he makes of the passive infinitives.¹ Sallust was very careful to place these in the body of the series, never at the beginning, and only once does he use a passive infinitive alone. The *Agricola* has one standing alone, and one in the body of the series. In the *Histories* the author's practice still resembles that of Sallust, only one passive infinitive out of 17 being used at the beginning of a series, while five stand alone. Through the *Annals* the tendency to break away from Sallust's restrictions becomes more and more pronounced until the last six books show more passive infinitives used at the beginning of a series than are used singly and in the body of a series combined.

The development of Tacitus' style involves the discarding also of other restrictions which had come to be associated with the his-

¹ *Esse* as a historical infinitive is found in Tacitus only a few times.

torical infinitive. Its use in subordinate clauses had been very rare, even in Sallust and Livy, and confined to loosely attached relative clauses and *cum inversum*, both of them hardly subordinate clauses at all, except in form. Tacitus not only has over twenty cases, compared with three each in Sallust and Livy,¹ but he extends it to various other temporal clauses. His specimens of the relative and *cum* are all of the type found in Sallust and Livy. But in the case of *ubi* (*Hist.* iii. 10; *An.* ii. 4; xi. 37; xii. 51), *postquam* (*An.* iii. 26), and *donec* (*An.* xiii. 57), the infinitive appears in the common forms of these clauses, in conjunction, to be sure, with co-ordinate indicatives.²

In like manner Tacitus discards most of the external framework with which the historical infinitive had become more or less associated. Of the many distinguishing and co-ordinating groups which Sallust had introduced, and others had adopted after him, *modo—modo* is the only one which he uses with much frequency. His opportunities for using them are unusually good, but he evidently disdains such a clear and simple means of expression, and frequently dissipates it by inconcinnity; cf. *Hist.* i. 23, 85; ii. 80; iii. 55; iv. 1, 34, 62; *An.* xi. 16; xii. 61, etc.

The abrupt type of Cicero³ is somewhat common in the *Histories* but gradually disappears in the *Annals*. The same is true of a type which Tacitus uses to some extent in the *Histories*, in which several infinitives of a series are each introduced by *non* or *nemo*; cf. *Hist.* i. 68; ii. 93; iii. 18, 36, 73, 76; *An.* xiii. 19, etc.

But all this disuse of ancient machinery means simply that Tacitus was finding a new basis for the construction, that of its causal and psychological relation to the context. Its earlier use, by Cicero and others, had been almost purely observational. They presented actions simply in the manner of people who had seen them, and in the way in which they were themselves impressed by them. This was often done with fine insight, as by Terence and Horace, and with splendid vim, as by Cicero himself.⁴ But it was reserved for Tacitus to develop fully the possibilities of the different types and to make a

¹ See p. 377 and Canter, *The Infinitive Construction in Livy*, 19.

² Cf. Huebenthal, *De usu inf. hist. ap. Sal. et Tac.*, 38.

³ Cf. p. 286.

⁴ Cf. p. 290.

somewhat rigid construction flexible enough to express the many varieties of mental states which he portrays. The older types of the construction are expanded by him in every direction and given new color and meaning. A few examples only can be given: *Hist.* iii. 25: "Simul attollere corpus, aperire humum, supremo erga parentem officio fungi." *Hist.* iv. 81: "Vespasianus primo inridere, aspernari; atque illis instantibus modo famam vanitatis metuere, modo obsecratione ipsorum et vocibus adulantium in spem induci: postremo," etc. *An.* iv. 28.

Especially effective is the use which Tacitus makes of the historical infinitive to depict the panic and demoralization and the paralysis of independent thought and action due to the imperial power; cf. *An.* i. 4, 7, 16; *Hist.* ii. 80; iii. 36, 73, and numerous other passages.

It is perhaps in his development of a certain type common in Sallust that Tacitus' expansion of the construction is best observed. Sallust's extensive use of the historical infinitive amounted largely, as we saw,¹ to the creating of an illusion, by the skilful use of certain devices. Chief of these was to support his infinitives by various auxiliary or preparatory expressions which lead the mind up to the historical infinitive and give the latter its proper setting.

One form—the appositional—is found where a series of infinitives gives the details of a comprehensive expression preceding them. Compare, for example, *Agricola* 37 and *Jugurtha* 101. 11, which were cited in a previous connection (p. 386).² This device is used quite extensively in both Sallust and Tacitus. But it remains fairly uniform in its nature, no great development being possible, except that in Tacitus the connection between the details and the preceding general term are occasionally very subtle; e.g., *Hist.* i. 23: "Studia militum iam pridem spe successionis aut paratu facinoris adfectaverat, in itinere, in agmine, in stationibus vetustissimum quemque militum nomine vocans ac memoria Neroniani comitatus contubernales appellando; alios agnoscere, quosdam requirere et pecunia aut gratia iuvare, inserendo saepe querellas et ambiguos de Galba ser-

¹ Cf. p. 375.

² There had been a very slight use of this device in the earlier authors; e.g., in Ter. *Andr.* 62, and Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 38. 109.

mones quaeque alia turbamenta vulgi." This sort of expression is rather more common in the *Histories* than in the *Annals*.

The second form of supporting expression in Sallust is usually an ablative or prepositional phrase, or an adjective or participial phrase modifying the subject of the infinitive, and contributing the impulsive or emotional background of the act, which would not have been so apparent from the infinitive alone;¹ e.g., *Jug.* 64. 5: "Ita cupidine atque ira, pessimis consultoribus, grassari, neque facto ullo neque dicto abstinere, quod modo ambitiosum foret," etc.

In Sallust these supporting words regularly stand very near the infinitives, in the same clauses, and the connection between them and the infinitives is direct and evident. Such expressions as *milites modesto imperio habiti simul et locupletes, ad caelum ferre*, require no commentary or special acumen for an appreciation of their full meaning. From the treatment they received the action of the soldiers follows as a matter of course.

In Tacitus the whole thing is, as a rule, very much less obvious. Instead of simple emotions only, the most complex states of mind are thus employed, and the presentation of these in their turn is often much less direct, and their bearing on the action expressed by the infinitives less apparent. The motive for this action is often merely suggested in the preceding passage or held in solution, as it were. *Hist.* ii. 80: "Dum quaeritur tempus, locus, quodque in re tali difficillimum est, prima vox, dum animo spes timor, ratio casus observantur, egressum cubiculo Vespasianum pauci milites, solito adsistentes ordine ut legatum salutaturi, imperatorem salutavere: tum ceteri adcurrere, Caesarem et Augustum et omnia principatus vocabula cumulare." *An.* ii. 52: "Is, natione Numida, in castris Romanis auxiliaria stipendia meritis, mox desertor, vagos primum et latrociniiis suetos ad praedam et raptus congregare, dein more militiae per vexilla et turmas componere, postremo non inconditae turbae, sed Musulamiorum dux haberi." In *An.* xi. 12, the infinitives at the end follow upon conditions described at considerable length through the chapter; cf. also *An.* ii. 5, 39; xii. 15, etc.

¹ Other examples have been given on p. 378. It was this device, very largely, which enabled Sallust to use successfully so many new words in the historical infinitive, and it was largely the small use of it, or of something like it, which made Livy's similar extension of the historical infinitive vocabulary turn out a comparative failure.

The influence of Virgil and of his use of the historical infinitive appears in Tacitus, especially in a certain preference for regarding what happens as due to conditions, or to the general trend and course of things, rather than to actions of individuals. This fate of the imperial government, as we may call it, occupies a place somewhat similar to that of the *fata deum* in Virgil. *An.* i. 3: "Ut Agrippa vita concessit, Lucium Caesarem euntem ad Hispanienses exercitus, Gaium remeantem Armenia et vulnere invalidum mors fato propera vel novercae Liviae dolus abstulit, Drusoque pridem extincto Nero solus e privignis erat, illuc cuncta vergere." *An.* xii. 9: "Despondeturque Octavia, ac super priorem necessitudinem sponsus iam et gener Domitius aequari Britannico studiis matris, arte eorum quis ob accusatam Messalinam ultio ex filio timebatur."

The construction thus comes at times, both in Sallust and in Tacitus, very close to what would in Greek have been expressed by the infinitive with *ὥστε*;¹ e.g., *An.* ii. 43: "Sed praeter paternos spiritus uxoris quoque Plancinae nobilitate et opibus accendebatur; vix Tiberio concedere, liberos eius ut multum infra despectare." For a case in Sallust, cf. *Jug.* 106. 6, printed on p. 378.

It is this conception of the historical infinitive, no doubt, which led to the frequent use of *igitur* by Tacitus as an introductory word. And when the construction had once become associated with the inevitable movement from the cause to its consequences, it is but a step to where it stands for the inevitable progress of change in general, within the same action or set of conditions, as well as from one to the other; e.g., *An.* i. 16: "Eo principio lascivire miles, discordare, pessimi cuiusque sermonibus praebere aures, denique luxum et otium cupere, disciplinam et laborem aspernari." Thus the frequent use by Tacitus of *primo*—*postremo*, and of *paulatim*, in connection with the historical infinitive, and the fondness which he shows for inchoative verbs in it, all become clear, and even the historical infinitive in a subordinate clause introduced by *donec* (*An.* xiii. 57) no longer seems so strange as it might otherwise.

Our discussion of the use made of the construction by Tacitus

¹ It is worth noting also that in some cases the historical infinitive is co-ordinate with clauses introduced by *fuere qui* with the subjunctive; cf. *Hist.* ii. 56, 70; *An.* xiv. 16, 23; *Jug.* 32. 3; 106. 6.

has shown pretty clearly that he shaped it and adapted it vigorously to his own individual style of thought and expression. In the degree in which he did this, he made it difficult for anyone to succeed him in his practice, and, as he lacked imitators as a historian, he had none here. The period of imitation had begun some time before him; indeed, he had himself been an imitator in his early works. But as a mature man he gives the impression of a creative force in the midst of the decline. This latter period, which, so far as our construction is concerned, was to continue for several centuries longer, has an importance and interest of its own, and must be reserved for separate treatment.

In the preparation of the following list of passages containing historical infinitives, I am especially indebted to Huebenthal, *De usu infinitivi historici apud Sallustium et Tacitum*, and Canter, *The Infinitive Construction in Livy*. The lists for Sallust (*Cat.* and *Jug.*), the *Bellum Africanum*, Virgil, and Tacitus are, I believe, complete, or as nearly so as a twofold search will make them. In Livy I have verified and, here and there, corrected Canter's lists, but have not gone over the text independently as a whole myself.

Sallust: *Cat.* 6. 4, 5; 10. 6; 11. 4; 12. 2, 5; 13. 3; 14. 6; 16. 2, 3; 17. 1; 20. 7; 21. 2; 23. 2; 24. 2; 25. 2, 5; 27. 2; 28. 4; 31. 2, 3, 8; 39. 2; 40. 4; 48. 1; 51. 29, 30; 56. 4; 60. 3, 4. *Jug.* 6. 1; 7. 6; 11. 8; 12. 5; 13. 5; 15. 2; 20. 8; 23. 1; 30. 1, 3; 32. 3; 33. 3; 36. 2; 38. 1, 2, 3, 5; 39. 1, 2; 41. 9; 43. 3; 44. 5; 45. 2; 46. 1, 6; 47. 3, 4; 49. 4; 50. 2, 4, 6; 51. 1, 4, 5; 53. 7; 55. 2, 3, 4, 8; 57. 4, 5; 58. 2, 3; 59. 3; 60. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7; 64. 2, 5; 65. 5; 66. 1; 67. 1, 2; 69. 2; 70. 1, 5; 72. 2; 73. 4, 5; 74. 1; 75. 10; 76. 3, 4; 79. 7; 82. 2; 83. 3; 84. 1, 2; 86. 2; 87. 1, 2; 88. 2; 89. 1; 91. 1, 4; 92. 2, 9; 93. 1; 94. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; 95. 3; 96. 2, 3; 97. 5; 98. 1, 2, 6; 100. 1, 3, 4; 101. 4, 6, 7, 11; 105. 4; 106. 6; 107. 3; 111. 2; 113. 2.

Bellum Africanum: 1. 3, 5; 7. 4; 8. 5; 12. 2; 15. 2; 16. 1, 4; 20. 1, 2, 3; 21. 1; 24. 2; 25. 5; 26. 6; 30. 1; 35. 1; 39. 1; 50. 3; 52. 5; 61. 7, 8; 70. 3; 71. 1; 78. 6; 82. 2; 85. 3.

Bellum Hispaniense: 1. 2; 29. 5; 33. 4.

Horace: *Sat.* i. 5. 11-12, 30-1; 8. 47, 49; 9. 8-10, 65-6; ii. 3. 316; 6. 113-4; 8. 35-6, 58-9; *Epist.* i. 7. 61-2, 66-8; *Epod.* 5. 83-6.

Virgil: *Georg.* i. 199-200; iv. 140-2; *Aen.* i. 423-5; ii. 97-9, 132-3, 169-70, 685-6, 699-700, 775; iii. 140-2, 666-8; iv. 421-3; v. 654-6, 685-6; vi. 490-3, 557-8; vii. 15-18, 77-78; viii. 215-6, 492-3, 689-90; ix. 377-8,

507-10, 538-9, 789-90; x. 288-90, 298-300, 457-8; xi. 142-3, 821-2, 883-5; xii. 216-8.

Livy: i. 4. 8, 9; 13. 1; 17. 7; 27. 7; 30. 6; 35. 1; 36. 3; 40. 6; 42. 1; 46. 6, 7; 47. 1, 7; 48. 3; 54. 1, 3, 10; 57. 6; 58. 3; ii. 3. 6; 6. 1, 2; 7. 8; 10. 4, 8; 13. 8; 22. 6; 23. 7, 10, 11, 13; 24. 2, 3, 7; 27. 1, 7, 13; 28. 1, 6, 9; 32. 5; 41. 7, 8; 44. 2, 5; 45. 3, 4, 5, 11; 47. 12; 48. 1; 50. 3; 52. 2; 53. 2; 54. 8, 9; 55. 2, 6; 56. 11; 57. 4; 58. 4, 5, 7, 8, 9; 65. 2; iii. 1. 7; 2. 12; 3. 4; 4. 7; 8. 1; 10. 10; 11. 9, 10; 12. 5, 6; 14. 5; 16. 1, 6; 17. 10; 18. 7, 8; 19. 1; 20. 2, 3; 25. 9; 31. 7; 35. 4, 5; 37. 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8; 38. 9, 10; 41. 1; 46. 7; 48. 6; 63. 3; 65. 9, 10; 69. 3; 70. 5; 72. 2; iv. 9. 5; 13. 4, 12; 14. 4, 5; 18. 1; 20. 2; 25. 10, 12; 31. 4, 8; 37. 10, 11; 39. 2, 4; 42. 4; 44. 3, 5; 45. 7; 46. 2; 54. 7, 9; 55. 2; 58. 9; 60. 3, 6; v. 7. 10, 11, 13; 9. 2, 3; 10. 3; 19. 3; 26. 9; 29. 8; 39. 1, 8, 13; 46. 1, 6; 47. 5, 11; vi. 3, 8, 9; 4. 6; 6. 6; 11. 7; 13. 4; 14. 12; 20. 15; 23. 2, 9; 24. 7, 8; 32. 1; 33. 9; 39. 5; vii. 12. 12, 13; 14. 2, 10; 17. 7; 20. 2; 23. 10; 32. 4; 33. 2; 37. 9; 40. 3; viii. 14. 1; 19. 6; 21. 6; 27. 2; 35. 3; 39. 4; ix. 7. 9, 12; 14. 3, 7, 16; 22. 3, 4; 26. 11; 27. 14; 33. 8; 35. 4; 40. 14; 45. 10; x. 15. 9; 19. 1, 2; 20. 10; 24. 5; 25. 9; 27. 6; 28. 12; 29. 1, 2, 3; 35. 13; 36. 10, 14; 41. 4; 42. 1; xxi. 4. 2, 4; 7. 8; 25. 12; 50. 1; 53. 1; 54. 9; 58. 5, 11; xxii. 8. 2, 3; 16. 4; 22. 21; 27. 2, 8; 28. 9; 29. 5; 30. 8; 40. 7; 41. 4; 42. 4; 44. 5; 50. 5, 6; xxiii. 3. 8, 14; 4. 2, 3, 5; 6. 4; 8. 6; 10. 13; 14. 7; 16. 10; 18. 9; 27. 2, 6; 34. 5; 35. 4; xxiv. 1. 2; 16. 16; 26. 16; 27. 1, 4; 32. 1, 2, 3; 37. 8; xxv. 3. 17; 8. 9; 10. 1, 2; 14. 8; 18. 8; 24. 5; 37. 9; xxvi. 15. 4; 27. 11; 29. 6; xxvii. 10. 1; 15. 14; 18. 12; 20. 9, 10; 25. 14; 28. 10; 37. 6; 41. 8; 45. 10, 11; 48. 11; 50. 5; 51. 1; xxviii. 6. 4; 16. 6; 21. 8; 33. 4; xxix. 1. 9; 5. 6; 6. 3; 9. 12; 10. 8; 15. 11, 12; 19. 3; 31. 10; xxx. 3. 7; 6. 2; 11. 6, 9, 10; 12. 6; 24. 10; 34. 6; 40. 8; 42. 11; xxxi. 6. 5; 25. 9; 35. 3; 41. 11, 12; xxxii. 10. 6; 22. 2; 30. 3; 36. 3, 4, 6; 39. 10; 40. 2; xxxiii. 12. 5; 15. 7; 25. 11; 32. 7; 33. 1; xxxiv. 11. 3; 12. 1; 19. 2; 33. 1; 37. 1; 39. 11; 41. 5; 50. 1; 58. 4; 61. 6, 8, 10; xxxv. 11. 8, 9, 10, 13; 12. 7; 31. 1; 36. 7; 45. 5; 46. 5; 47. 2; 49. 1; xxxvi. 15. 2; 19. 2; 32. 3; 34. 5; xxxvii. 10. 7, 9; 11. 9; 15. 1; 19. 1; 20. 8; 26. 12; 32. 12; 52. 10; xxxviii. 2. 7; 8. 6; 12. 6; 14. 8, 13; 25. 13; 33. 6, 7; 40. 10; xxxix. 5. 1; 10. 8; 12. 7; 13. 3, 7; 31. 9; 34. 6; 39. 4, 5; xl. 6. 7; 8. 4; 26. 4, 5; 40. 8; 46. 14; 47. 2; 55. 5; 56. 2, 7; 58. 2; xli. 20. 3, 4; xlii. 3. 5; 59. 3; 60. 3, 4; 62. 13, 14; 65. 11; 66. 5; xliii. 1. 8, 9; 17. 8; xliv. 4. 6; 5. 1; 7. 3, 8, 9; 10. 1; 25. 11; 26. 6; 28. 9; 34. 8; 36. 7; xlv. 1. 4; 5. 9, 10; 6. 2; 30. 2; 36. 8, 9; 41. 7.

Seneca Rhetor: *Controv.* iii. Prol. 16.

Tacitus: *Germ.* 7; *Agr.* 5, 15, 18 (2), 19, 20, 21, 27, 34, 36, 37, 38, 42; *Hist.* i. 23, 35, 36, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 62, 65, 68, 71, 72, 81, 85, 89; ii. 5, 6, 11, 12, 18, 19, 22, 23, 28, 29, 30 (2), 35, 41, 42, 46, 52, 56, 70, 78, 80, 82, 84, 93, 94; iii. 10, 17 (2), 18, 25, 31, 33, 36, 48, 49, 53, 55, 58, 60, 63 (2), 73, 76, 84; iv. 1 (2), 2, 11, 16, 29, 34, 42, 46, 49, 54, 62, 67, 70, 80, 81, 83, 84; v. 15, 22;

Ann. i. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 16 (2), 19, 21, 25, 28 (2), 31, 34, 46, 64, 65, 70 (2), 71; ii. 4, 5, 23, 29, 31, 39, 40, 43, 52, 55, 57, 59, 64; iii. 14, 20, 26, 42, 45, 46; iv. 2, 12, 25, 28, 48, 49 (2), 50, 51, 54, 55, 60, 62, 68, 69 (2), 74; v. 4; vi. 17, 19, 21, 26, 32, 33, 34 (2), 35, 44, 50; xi. 12, 16, 28, 31, 34, 37 (2); xii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 12, 14, 15, 34, 35 (2), 42, 44, 46, 47, 51, 54, 65, 68; xiii. 3 (2), 13 (2), 14 (2), 15 (2), 18, 19, 35, 37, 40, 43, 44 (2), 45, 46 (2), 57; xiv. 3, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14, 15 (2), 16, 23; xv. 5, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 27, 37 (2), 38, 51, 58, 71; xvi. 5, 13, 19.

TERRE HAUTE, IND.